



PATENT
Docket No.: ST01013USU (102-US-U1)
09/920,898

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: McConnell et al. OLD DOCKET NO.: SIRF.102USU1
NEW DOCKET NO.: ST01013USU (102-US-U1)
SERIAL NO.: 09/920,898 GROUP ART UNIT: 3662
DATE FILED: August 2, 2001 EXAMINER: Blum, Theodore M.
CONFIRMATION NO.: 9850

TITLE: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR REDUCING GPS RECEIVER
JAMMING DURING TRANSMISSION IN A WIRELESS RECEIVER

Certificate of Mailing
I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 7, 2004.

Jeffrey C. Wilk
Jeffrey C. Wilk

January 7, 2004

RECEIVED
JAN 13 2004
OFFICE OF PETITIONS

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

CHANGE OF ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER

The Attorney Docket's Number has been changed from the old docket number:
"SIRF.102USU1" to the new Attorney Docket Number "ST01013USU (102-US-U1)".

9

PATENT
Docket No.: ST01013USU (102-US-U1)
09/920,898

RECEIVED
JAN 13 2004

PETITION FOR REVIVAL OF AN APPLICATION FOR PATENT ABANDONED
UNINTENTIONALLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to file a timely and proper reply to an Office Action mailed October 17, 2002 by the USPTO (hereinafter "Office Action"). The date of abandonment is the day after the expiration date of the period set for reply in the Office Action, plus an extension or extensions of time if actually obtained. In the present case, the date of abandonment is believed to be January 18, 2003.

Applicants hereby petition for revival of this application.

Submitted with this petition is (1) the appropriate petition fee under 37 CFR 1.17(m); and (2) an Amendment under 37 CFR 1.111 in reply to the above-identified Office Action.

Applicants respectfully submit that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the required reply until the filing of a grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional.

In support of this petition, applicants respectfully submit the following facts believed to be accurate.

Prior to receipt by the assignee of the Office Action, SiRF Technologies, Inc. (hereinafter "SiRF"), a former in-house patent counsel and employee of SiRF (hereinafter "former SiRF counsel") was responsible for the prosecution of the present application. The former SiRF counsel's responsibilities included receiving and processing correspondence from the USPTO, including Office Actions. On or about February 2002, the former SiRF counsel ceased his employment with SiRF and became associated with a private law firm. As a result of the former

SiRF counsel's departure, SiRF was left with no in-house patent counsel or any other person having specialized knowledge of USPTO practice.

Subsequent to the former SiRF counsel's departure, the Office Action was sent to SiRF's former Los Angeles office, as shown by the correspondence address on the Office Action. It is believed that a change of address was not filed in the present application prior to receipt thereof by SiRF. Thus, it is believed that the Office Action was not received directly by any in-house or outside patent counsel, or forwarded to the attention of any outside patent counsel. Moreover, at time of receipt of the Office Action at SiRF's Los Angeles office, SiRF was in the process of shutting down its Los Angeles office and transferring operations to its San Jose office.

On or about May 2002, SiRF hired new in-house patent counsel (hereinafter "new SiRF counsel"), who is located in the San Jose office. On May 29, 2003, SiRF received the Notice of Abandonment in the present application, at SiRF's Los Angeles office. Thereafter, SiRF's Los Angeles office forwarded the Notice of Abandonment to the new SiRF counsel in the San Jose office. The new SiRF counsel then notified The Eclipse Group, the law firm presently handling this application and undersigned of this petition. At the time of receipt of the Notice of Abandonment, neither the new SiRF counsel nor The Eclipse Group possessed the Office Action that had been received at the Los Angeles office. Upon receipt of the Notice of Abandonment, both The Eclipse Group and the new SiRF counsel searched their respective files but could not locate the Office Action referenced in the Notice of Abandonment. Thereafter, an attorney with The Eclipse Group contacted the Examiner of the present application and requested a faxed copy of the Office Action, which was received by The Eclipse Group on August 27, 2003. Since that time, The Eclipse Group and the new SiRF counsel have been investigating the cause of the

abandonment and attempting to determine responsibility therefore, as well as studying the Office Action and preparing the reply filed herewith.

It will be further noted that the Office Action was favorable insofar as the broadest apparatus claim, claim 1, was allowed by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the present application was abandoned unintentionally.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the present application be revived, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 7, 2004

By: _____



Francisco A. Rubio-Campos
Registration No. 45,358
Attorney for Applicant
Phone: (949) 448-9410
Fax: (714) 948-8903

The Eclipse Group
26895 Aliso Creek Road
Suite B-104
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656-5301

Customer No. 34408